



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.

VI. THE CALEBITE TRADITION.

IN the course of the preceding section it was argued that a specific "Calebite" tradition could be traced in the story of the Exodus¹. With Caleb is associated the kin of Moses' father-in-law, the Kenites, whose entrance into the extreme south of Judah belongs more naturally to a journey northwards from Kadesh than to any circular migration round by Shittim and Gilgal. At the first glance the term "Calebite," as applied to such a tradition, does not seem to be sufficiently comprehensive, but it is perhaps possible to show that the name became prominent (whence, probably its choice in the story of the spies), and the scattered details in the Old Testament suggest that it was more widely applied than is usually understood. At the outset, it is not difficult to find a certain appropriateness in the fact that the Kenites and Calebites are connected in tradition. A singular Judæan genealogy in 1 Chron. iv. 17 actually mentions a Miriam and a Jether (i. e. Jethro: cp. Exod. iv. 18) in a context which, although admittedly obscure in details, relates to Caleb (ver. 15 sq.). Caleb, himself, as a Kenizzite, belongs to Edomite stock, and in the Edomite lists (Gen. xxxvi. 4, 17) we find the name Reuel, which is also that given, according to another version, to the father-in-law of Moses. Jether, too, recurs as Edomite in Gen. xxxvi. 40 (LXX for תַּיִל), comp. Ithran (יִתְרָן), *ibid.* v. 26; and if the same name appears again in a Jerahmeelite genealogy (1 Chron. ii. 32), this only emphasizes the fact that, as Nöldeke states, "there are manifold traces of a mingling of Edomites and Horites with the neighbouring Israelite tribes²." Since it is found that Korah is said to be a "son" of Hebron (1 Chron. ii. 43) and is thus traditionally connected with Caleb, it is quite in accordance with the above view that in Gen. xxxvi. 5, &c., he is Edomite, and that in Num. xvi he enters prominently into one of the Kadesh narratives. And it follows from this that since the clans Caleb and Jerahmeel are spoken of as "brothers" and occupied seats

¹ Cp. Moore, *Ency. Bib.*, col. 1443, par. v, who speaks of "a more primitive form of Judæan (or Calebite) tradition," according to which the Israelites, after crossing the Yam Sûph, proceeded direct to Kadesh.

² *Ency. Bib.*, art. "Edom," § 3 end.

in close contiguity, it is possible that they shared the same fortunes throughout, or possessed similar traditions. On these grounds it is tempting to suppose that Peleth the father of On (Num. xvi. 1) is not to be separated from Peleth the Jerahmeelite (1 Chron. ii. 33)¹. Without going into further detail, it may be stated that there is much evidence that some bond closely united the clans which became incorporated into Judah with those which lay further to the south and were ascribed to Edom (Gen. xxxvi). It is extremely difficult to comprehend clearly all the facts which this bond implies, but it may be inferred not only that some relationship was felt between them, but also that there were several clans apart from Calebites and Kenites which shared the tradition of a migration from Kadesh.

Now, it is only in the course of the growth of the story of Korah's revolt that he becomes a Levite. Originally, it is probable that he was regarded simply as a member of one of the southern clans. Unfortunately, little is known of the early history of the Levites, and although the prophecy in Gen. xlix. 5-7 reflects their actual condition at the time when it was written, it is difficult to trace their rise. The possibility must be conceded that Levi as a tribal name is merely a genealogical fiction. The association of both Simeon and Levi with Shechem may be taken as evidence of the wide diffusion of the early Levitical traditions. Simeon is best known as a southern tribe: Levi as his "brother" should also be looked for in the same quarter, and when the Kadesh-narratives speak not of Aaron but of Moses, and not of Levites but of Caleb, it is proper to inquire whether the development expresses historical facts and whether any real bond of connexion can be found to link the Levites with the clans of southern origin.

As a matter of fact, when one proceeds to inspect the names of the Levites it is found that they fall into four classes. (*a*) A large number are colourless, their only distinctive mark being the lateness of their type. Others are associated clearly (*b*) with the family of Moses or (*c*) with clans of South Palestine². Finally (*d*), there are some which prove to be without analogy in Hebrew or have the appearance of being dialectical³. We can scarcely regard the name

¹ The alternative assumption is that Peleth is to be emended into the Reubenite Pallu (cp. Gen. xlii. 9); see further Gray, *Numbers*, pp. 190, 194 sq.

² The two classes belong together owing to the relation which subsists between *b* and *c*, p. 168 above.

³ Of Arabian (Gershon), or, as in the case of Phinehas, of Egyptian origin. But the latter does not necessarily imply that Phinehas lived in Egypt, see below, p. 179, n. 1.

of the Levitical division Mushi as any other than a derivative of Mosheh, nor can we sever Gershom and Eliezer the sons of Moses from the Gershonite Levites or from Eleazar the son of Aaron—it is even possible, though the connexion is less obvious, that the Merarites derived their name from Miriam (מֵרָרִי, מֵרָרִים). If we bear this in mind, it will appear at least a remarkable coincidence that the names of the *Gershonite* Levites, Shimei, Jahath, Zimmah, and Zerah, should correspond very closely to Shammah (cp. interchange of forms in 1 Sam. xvi. 9, 2 Sam. xiii. 3, xxi. 21), Nahath, Mizzah (מִצָּח, מִצָּחִי), and Zerah the sons of the Edomite (and Mosaic) Reuel. Such Levite gentilities as Hebroni and Libni point conclusively to Hebron and Libnah, Mahli probably to Mahalath (Gen. xxviii. 9), and Eder and Shamir as names of Levites are identical with Judæan places (Josh. xv. 21, 48). Jeremoth seems to be an intentional or unintentional derivative from Yarmuth; Shebuel and Shubael suggest comparison with Shobal, a name which is Edomite and Calebite.

Thus it seems clear that we must allow some relationship between the Levites and the clans from the south. These South Palestinian communities, whether regarded as Levitical or secular families, were closely united, and specific traditions associate them with Kadesh and the journey northwards¹. But it is obvious that such a conclusion cannot be pressed too far. There is always a tendency for tradition to express itself in generalizing terms beyond proper limits. Not every Israelite was a full member of the tribe in which he was enrolled, and although the Israelites believed that they came out of Egypt, few critics would agree that *every* tribe had been there. Hence it would be an unwarranted assumption to claim that all Levites were southerners or the converse; the term could be, and no doubt was, extended to include all members of the caste, and the act of adoption or incorporation would lead all new-comers to claim the same ancestry as the rest. Moreover, it is essential to remember that

¹ The evidence of the proper names, usually accepted as proof of the relationship between Judæan and Edomite clans, is thus extended to the Levites, and such a growth as that of the figure of Korah is regarded as typical. Mosaicites become Aaronites (cp. 1 Chron. xxiii. 14) even as Moses in the narratives obtains the assistance of Aaron (originally of a Jethro or Hobab). This gradual development of ideas illustrates the relation between the pre-eminence of Caleb and the selection of the Levites, each of which is narrated before the commencement of a journey (*J.Q.R.*, XVIII, 746 sqq., 752 sq., 755). But there would probably be no room for Caleb by the side of Levi in any old document, and the event recorded in Exod. xxxiii. 26 sqq. implies a relatively later historical period, when the term Levites prevailed, and their “national” traditions were recast.

we are dealing, not with plain historical narratives, but with records whose historical kernel is uncertain. What was told of Caleb, Korah, Bezalel, and others may represent a persistent belief even though the details may not be strictly in accordance with the facts. The first endeavour must always be to collect such beliefs. It is necessary, therefore, to determine whether the links which unite Kadesh, the southern clans, and the Levites recur with sufficient consistency to enable us to infer that there was a great body of tradition which pointed to the south of Palestine as opposed to that specifically Israelite tradition which is to be associated with the crossing of the Jordan. It seems probable that the required evidence actually exists.

The old source in Num. xvi includes Dathan and Abiram sons of Eliab ben Reuben. There is no obvious reason why Reuben should be associated with Levites or Calebites, although a careful study of the Reubenite traditions suggests that the tribe was once closely connected with the south of Judah¹. On the other hand, the mere mention of Reuben seems to carry us away to the route round by the Dead Sea, and since Kadesh, or even a more northerly place, would be an appropriate starting-point for such a journey, there is just the possibility that the story of the dissension may have led to the account of a twofold move, the one to Judah, the other towards Moab². Unfortunately, very little tradition has been preserved which would throw light upon the question, and it is difficult to determine whether the *Reubenite* origin of Dathan and Abiram is original, or how far attempts may not have been made to give effect to the development of traditions which were held by this tribe alone³.

In Num. xxv P relates a story of the Simeonite Zimri, and here at least it is evident that, irrespective of the details of the incident, Simeon is the tribe which is to be expected in a cycle of traditions dealing with the south. Another story, also by P, deals with the grandson of Dibri the Danite (Lev. xxiv)⁴, and the mention of this tribe brings us to the question of the association of Dan with the Kadesh narratives. The fact that Dan appears to be held up for blame in Lev. xxiv proves nothing for the early history: there are too many stories of offences (Moses, Aaron, Miriam) for this to form

¹ It will suffice to refer further to H. W. Hogg's article "Reuben" in *Ency. Bib.*

² See *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 757 and 758, note 1.

³ e. g. a subsequent move from Judah to Moab.

⁴ On a possible connexion between Dibri and Zimri, see *Ency. Bib.* col. 1101, note; and on the possibility that P builds upon older tradition see above *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 744, 753, 760.

the foundation for any theory. The first point to be noticed is the tradition of the Danite Aholiab, the partner of Bezalel the Calebite. The strange name Aholiab finds analogies in S. Arabian inscriptions and in Phoenician, and it is to be noted that the famous Phoenician Hiram was, on his mother's side, of Naphtalite (1 Kings vii. 14) or of Danite origin (2 Chron. ii. 14). This variation is slight and intelligible, for both Dan and Naphtali are "sons" of Bilhah and may have been as closely linked in the south (Dan's earlier seats) as they certainly were subsequently in the north¹. There is also the possibility that the names Hiram and Hur are identical, and it is curious that in the time of Josephus the latter was identified with the husband of Miriam; but this evidence is naturally weak, and it is more to the point to notice that tradition knew of an encampment of Kenites near Kadesh in Naphtali (Judges iv. 11). Important, also, is the fact that the Danite priesthood traced its origin to Gershom, a Levite of Bethlehem, and son of Moses, since in the story of the Danites some intercourse between the tribesmen and the Levite is explicitly presupposed. Close relationship is found, also, in the genealogies of 1 Chron. ii where the southern Danite seats are connected with cities in Judah with which Caleb, Kenites, and Bethlehem itself are already associated. Moreover, we can hardly separate the name Manoah from the Judean Manahath (Josh. xv. 59, LXX) or from the clan of the Manahathites, and under these circumstances it is very probable that the Danite Mahaneh-Dan should be corrected into Manahath-Dan. Hence, when the clan is traced back to Shobal a son of Caleb, it is quite appropriate that the Edomite list in Gen. xxxvi. 23 should include a Manahath among the "sons" of Shobal². Thus, when Dan and Caleb are linked in the narratives of the wilderness and in the genealogies of Judah, when priests of Dan are of Mosaic origin and Kenites encamp under the protection of its brother tribe, and when relations between Dan and Levites are found to be susceptible of explanation, it is very difficult not to ignore the persistency and also the consistency of the traditions³. Consequently, the position of Dan in the Kadesh narratives appears to be quite as appropriate as that of Caleb, Korah, and the Levites.

But not only is Dan found in the south and north, the story of the despoiled sanctuary in the highlands of Ephraim, concisely and pithily told in its present form, is an indication that much more

¹ Comp. Bilhan, an Edomite name (Gen. xxxvi. 27); and see H. W. Hogg, *Ency. Bib.*, art. "Bilhah."

² See above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 354, n. 1.

³ That the Danite migration was subsequent to David's time appears probable on independent grounds (*ibid.* p. 355).

was known of the circumstance than the composite story in Judges (xvii sq.) relates. The story has been brought into touch with that of Dinah at Shechem—another specimen of the kind of tradition that was current—and the fact that here Levi and Simeon are the leading figures tends to connect Dinah with the traditions of Dan. The stories of the tribal fortunes are thus analogous to those of the national ancestors, and in recognizing that the belief existed that such a tribe as Simeon had relations in the south of Palestine and at Shechem¹, or that Danite traditions knew of the tribe's dealings in three distinct parts of Palestine, we are brought face to face with the same kind of phenomena that recur in the stories of the patriarchs.

The recovery of allied traditions is thus of the utmost value for historical investigation, and it is particularly important to notice that whilst the "Calebite" tradition in the story of the exodus has been almost wiped out and the points of evidence noticed in the course of this section are scattered and fragmentary², the "Israelite" view is presented as a finished scheme, superimposed, however, upon its rival. With its description of an invasion of Palestine by Joshua from beyond the Jordan the "Israelite" tradition presents features which can be traced in the stories of Abraham, Jacob, and Saul. The alternative view, on the other hand (whether we call it "Calebite" or "Levitical"), is almost as comprehensive, and associates itself generally with the history of David. David's relation to the southern clans is clear. He is found at Ziklag, on friendly terms with the Philistines (cp. Isaac), and it is to be inferred from Josh. xv. 31 that the place lay far to the south (see *J. Q. R.*, XVII, p. 788). In his movement northwards he regularly consults the oracle³ which is in

¹ It need scarcely be emphasized that we are dealing with traditions without investigating the historical kernel which may underly them; hence, although there is very little evidence to connect the tribe Simeon with central or (like Dan) with northern Palestine, it seems clear that the chronicler's tradition of the Simeonites' home in 2 Chron. xv. 9 and xxxiv. 6 (between Ephraim and Naphtali) cannot be disassociated from the situation in Gen. xxxiv.

² See above *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 759 and n. 1.

³ On the theory outlined above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 352 sq., 356, this was no other than the ark (see especially 1 Kings ii. 26); "ephod" in 1 Sam. xxiii. 9, xxx. 7 would thus be an intentional alteration to avoid the contradiction with the tradition in 1 Sam. vii. 1, 2. Also in 1 Sam. xiv. 18 the LXX corrects "ark" to "ephod," although it is probable that this narrative, too, was ignorant of the same tradition: it is evident from the text of the latter part of this verse that efforts have been made to alter its original tenor. (On xiv. 3, see *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 124.) An interesting analogy is

the care of his priest Abiathar (cp. the name Jether-Jethro). Intimate relations with the clans of the Negeb are reflected. Before Jerusalem could be held, it was necessary to clear the district of an enemy, and with the installation of the ark a fitting climax to the journey was seen (2 Sam. vii. 6, 23)¹. This represents the *southern* point of view. On the other hand, in the installation of the ark at Shiloh, which is presupposed in the book of Joshua, after the invasion from the *east*, may we recognize a parallel climax? If so, the account of the ark in 1 Sam. v-vii. 1, which appears to have belonged originally to neither, probably serves the purpose of reconciling the conflicting representations².

Everywhere it is necessary to let the narratives speak for themselves and to attempt to understand their standpoint before their relative historical value can be estimated. We can scarcely sever the traditions of David's relations with Israel whilst at the court of Saul from the further development which is preserved by the chronicler. The latter, at all events in his view that men from all the tribes of Israel deserted Saul and came to David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii), is consistent with the situations represented in the earlier book (cp. 1 Sam. xviii. 5 sqq., 16, 22, 30) and both must be judged together³. The historian who naturally starts by collecting all the material bearing upon his subject cannot ignore this later form of tradition, and when he proceeds to pass judgment upon its genuineness will find it difficult to determine precisely where fact ceases and fancy begins. That one detail is preserved in the book of Chronicles and the other in Samuel

found in 1 Sam. xvii. 54, where the writer was so much out of touch with the history of the time that he assumed that Jerusalem was Israelite. A similar loss of perspective in Gen. xxvi. 1 finds Philistines in the time of Isaac. See below, p. 183, n. 1.

¹ Note even the chronicler's representation of tradition (1 Chron. xxiii. 26): "and also the Levites shall have no more need to carry the tabernacle," &c. That there were traditions which ignored the fortunes of the ark in the *Israelite* conquest (cp. Kennedy, *Samuel*, p. 224) is extremely significant. Even 1 Chron. vii. 27 treats Joshua as indigeneous (but note ver. 26).

² The objection that if the southern clans had really taken the ark with them it could not have been with David, since Caleb was already in its seat in the Negeb, would only have weight *if* it were true that the same body of traditions could not contain inconsistent views. On the contrary, although the *Israelite* traditions had located the ark at Shiloh, in Judges xx. 27 sq. it is found at Bethel. As a matter of fact the southern cycle seems to have undergone constant development on independent lines, partly through the influence of David's figure.

³ *J. Q. R.*, XVII, 787.

is not enough by itself to attest its value: late writings, where they do not chance to preserve old genuine material, *may* naturally represent late stages in the development of traditions quite as reputable as those in earlier works¹. Indeed, the admittedly close relation between David and the Judaeen clans, and the evidence connecting the latter with the Levites suggests that herein lies the germ of the chronicler's account of the institution of the Levitical orders by David. Clothed though it is in a wealth of detail which is almost entirely worthless², it embodies the conviction that the ideal king could not be imagined apart from the sacred sect (cp. both Jer. xxxiii. 17 sq. and Zech. xii. 12 sq.), and it is perhaps pertinent to recall that the scribal families are associated with Calebite and Kenite clans and with Bethlehem the traditional birthplace of David. From what is known of the population of this district the energetic development of Levitical tradition appears to be self-evident.

Perhaps no one can read Num. xiv. 11-24 or Josh. xiv. 6-15 without observing the very great importance of Caleb in traditions of a relatively late age. The promise that his seed should possess the land upon which he had trodden points at least to the diligent preservation of the traditions of the clan, and to the interest which was taken in its fortunes³. It is difficult to suppose that these passages stood alone, and it is only when one perceives that there were other clans closely associated with Caleb that it is possible to infer that the eponym Caleb was far from being so restricted as the genealogical information in 1 Chron. ii would suggest. This chapter, as is well known, reflects two conditions of the clan: (a) its seat in the south of Judah, and (b) a further movement northwards to the district of Bethlehem. That some relationship was felt or feigned with east Jordanic clans seems to follow from the statement that Hezron the "father" of Caleb and Jerahmeel married the daughter of Machir the father of Gilead and thus became the ancestor of Segub and Jair (vers. 21 sq.). In view of familiar genealogical fictions it would be extremely precarious to infer that these eastern clans were physically related to Judaeen clans, and the evidence

¹ By earlier works is meant those which were completed at an earlier date. Under the circumstances the latest portions of these may well be almost contemporary with the earlier portions of those writings which were not completed until a much later date.

² The evidence of the proper names, however, is instructive (see G. B. Gray, *Hebrew Proper-names*).

³ Note, also, the pious wish for the extension of the borders of Jabez, a mysterious name but with Calebite or Kenite affinities (1 Chron. ii. 55, iv. 9 sq.).

can only have as much *historical* value as the varied genealogical details of the tribes of Israel. But there appears to be no intelligible reason why the chronicler should have invented his statement, and since his representation of Caleb's movements is admitted to rest upon sound tradition it is necessary to consider whether the notice is entirely isolated or not.

The notion that certain "sons of Hezron," clans of nomadic origin¹, proceeded upwards to Judah and that others of the same stock pursued their way to the east of the Jordan is not an unnatural one. Already² in the story of the wanderings there was reason to suppose that tradition (at some undefined stage) knew of a march across the northern end of Edom, which ended with the achievements of the clans Machir and Jair (Num. xxii. 39 sqq.). On the assumption that P's narratives may be based upon earlier sources it should be noticed that the tribe of Manasseh comes to the fore and that the fortunes of Reuben and Gad are equally prominent. This evidence by itself, however suggestive, is as inconclusive as the position of Reuben in the story of Korah's revolt, to which a precise reference is made in the story of the daughters of Zelophehad (xxvii. 3). But the same thread runs through this series, and the presence of the *old* notice of Machir and Jair is significant in such a context.

Further, the patriarch Isaac is found sojourning among the Philistines of Gerar (Gen. xxvi) in a district which another writer places between Kadesh and Shur (chap. xx). Stories are told of his strife with the natives and of his covenant at Beersheba, and here are located the incidents which lead to the separation of Esau and Jacob. Since one version placed the theophany at Bethel on Jacob's *return* from Shechem³, it is to be inferred that it knew of a direct journey from Beersheba to Haran (see Gen. xxviii. 10). Now the return represents a great national tradition which can be traced in the stories of Abraham and Joshua, conceivably also, of Saul⁴. This being so, the question arises whether Jacob's journey northwards to his relatives may not represent a rival tradition of quite distinct origin. It would not suffice to regard the step as a necessary prelude

¹ The name Hezron suggests nomadic encampments.

² Above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 757 sq.; see also p. 171.

³ Above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 539 sq.

⁴ See *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 539 sqq. Here the separation of Esau and Jacob is preserved in a context after the departure from Bethel (Gen. xxxvi. 6 sqq.), according to the other tradition the separation precedes the journey, and P at this stage preserves a brief notice of Esau's marriages (xxviii. 9). (The interpretation of the meeting in Gen. xxxii, however, remains obscure. The passage may not be in its true place.)

to the events in Gen. xxix sqq., since it would be equally reasonable to hold that the entire account of the rivalry between Jacob and Esau was intended to explain the patriarch's appearance in the Aramaean district. It seems preferable to connect the details with the suggested evidence for the existence of two great conflicting traditions, and one ventures to conclude that there was a stage in the southern tradition when relationship was claimed by the Judaeans with those east of the Jordan.

The existence of some union of this kind would appear to throw light upon certain details in the traditions of David. Evidently some friendliness between Moab and David was intelligible to the writer of 1 Sam. xxii. 3 sq., although no very clear explanation has been suggested. Later tradition in the genealogy appended to the book of Ruth affords no help, since "the fact that a young woman had married into the tribe of Judah, renouncing her own gods and leaving her father's house, would constitute a precarious title for her great-grandson in claiming protection" (H. P. Smith). Since it can scarcely be supposed that a couple of verses in 1 Sam. xxii gave birth to the later genealogy, it is reasonable to assume that both notices have drawn upon a common tradition which was evidently not a scanty one. Again, although it has appeared natural to regard David's priest Ira the *Jairite* (2 Sam. xx. 26) as originally a man of Jattir in Judah¹, recent commentators accept the text, although they do not seem to explain the presence of this Gileadite. If Ira should be restored also in viii. 18 with Klostermann and Budde, the choice of a man from Ishbaal's kingdom (ii. 8) at this early period (on the traditional view) becomes more singular. But the restoration is on textual grounds a probable one, and it is thus necessary to notice the remarkable combination—David's sons and a *Jairite*! Yet again, reference was made in the first section to David's flight to Mahanaim after the revolt of Absalom (*J. Q. R.*, XVII, 797); it was here that Ishbaal had set up his throne, and one hardly understands how David could have hoped for assistance, especially if, according to the ordinary view, all Israel (including Saul's followers) followed Absalom. But if the account of Ishbaal's sovereignty is from an entirely distinct tradition, this difficulty is removed, and the kindness of Machir and Barzillai the Gileadite finds a plausible explanation. On these grounds it may be argued that the chronicler's tradition of the common origin of Machir and Jair, Caleb and Jerahmeel is no isolated detail, still less is it the invention of his age².

¹ Reading *יִצְחָק* for *יִצְחָק* with the Peshitta and Lucian.

² It is naturally doubtful whether this tradition would explain the two Geshurs (Joshua xiii. 2, 11), or the recurrence of the apparent clan-name

It is obviously precarious to base theories upon tribal traditions alone, and the free application of the genealogical or ethnological key without the support of other considerations is unsafe. Unprejudiced investigation when conducted comprehensively can draw no distinction between so-called patriarchal records and those which are usually regarded as historical. Traditions—"That which has been handed down"—manifest themselves in genealogies, sagas, and in the stories of heroes, and these classes of evidence require to be studied with equal care for the light that they may be expected to throw upon each other. The growth of national tradition is marked by many stages in which conflicting views are compromised or reconciled, and granted that alien clans were absorbed, there would naturally result in course of time a mingling of traditions. It is hardly to be expected that any one scheme would at once leap into popular favour, and divergent forms could still appear even after a compromise had been effected.

The theory that there were two main bodies of tradition, one of which pointed to a movement from the south upwards to the north and north-east, whilst the other referred it from the east westwards, is undoubtedly open to criticism on account of the scattered evidence upon which the former is based, but it may be maintained that it covers a number of details which fit only loosely into the latter. That S¹ has been rigorously treated can be explained naturally by the desire to give the prominence to E². That historical difficulties

Maacah in the south and east (Gen. xxii. 24, 1 Chron. vii. 16). Other points of uncertain value which may be noticed are (a) the isolated passage Num. xxi. 16-18a, which brings the people as far as Beer (Beersheba, cp. Gen. xxviii. 10 and *Ency. Bib.*, col. 2651, n. 4); thenceforth the narratives deal entirely with the journey east of the Dead Sea: was Beersheba the scene of a parting of the clans? (b) The possibility that Jacob's visit to his relatives was to a nearer place than Harran has been frequently upheld (e.g. by C. T. Beke, *Origines Biblicae*, 1834, i. 131); for the view that the names Zilpah and Zelophehad were identical, see C. Niebuhr, *Gesch.*, I, 253, and for Cheyne's suggestion that these, as also Milcah the wife of Nahor, should be corrected to Salecah (Salhad), see *Ency. Bib.*, sub voc. These views would tend to bring the story of Jacob's visit into closer touch with the narratives in Numbers. It may be added that the evidence above in the text does not favour the view that the conquest of Gilead was made by tribes from the west of the Jordan.

¹ For the sake of convenience use may be made of the symbols E (i. e. east, the prevailing tradition) and S (i. e. south, the tradition of the movement from the south northwards into Judah).

² Cp. *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 759 and note 1 with references.

may be found cannot be gainsaid, but in view of the difficulty of interpreting the tribal traditions of Israel which has been felt by all who have approached the study, a new theory may be attempted. E itself, when it implies the existence of Judah and Benjamin as distinct entities, the survival of Simeon and Reuben, and the secular position of Levi, presupposes conditions which are so complicated that there is considerable conflict of opinion regarding the interpretation of its main outlines: owing to the character of the evidence it will perhaps never be possible to remove all the difficulties which confront one.

The view of Wellhausen and others that the original tribes were seven, six of which were sons of Leah, and one (Joseph) the son of Rachel, confirms the early pre-eminence of S, but of Joseph the original Kadesh stories appear to contain no trace. Nor is the connexion of these narratives with Egypt at all conclusively established until that stage is reached where Sinai-Horeb comes to the fore. Naturally, the historicity of the exodus from Egypt is not endangered thereby, one has only to observe the brief treatment of other similar journeys (e. g. Abraham, Jacob, Ezra)¹. Again, the fluctuation of tradition of the course taken between Kadesh and the arrival at the Jordan can scarcely be ignored (see *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 757), and although the view which P holds appears to rest upon an old foundation, on historical grounds the tradition of a journey from the gulf of 'Akabah northwards can with difficulty be applied to any of the Israelite tribes. But it must be admitted that such a movement, along the trade-route which led up to Moab, is in itself perfectly natural. A more consecutive tradition appears in the account of the conquest under Joshua, although again there are earlier and later views, and considerable obscurity is attached to the question of the occupation of central Palestine (see above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 539).

¹ In the growth of tradition, the story of the individual Joseph seems important, but the traditions of the Josephite tribes are scanty (see *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, p. 539, n. 2). Apart from the controversial question of the extension of the term Misraim and the twofold Goshen, it is not unreasonable to suppose that traces of Egyptian influence continued to prevail in South Palestine even in the days of the monarchy. Spiegelberg's explanation of the name Phicol (Abimelech's captain, Gen. xxi. 22, xxvi. 26) as "man of Kharu" (Syria and Palestine) is particularly interesting in view of the parallel name Phinehas (*Orientalist. Lit. Zeitung*, Feb. 1906), and the suggestion that Hur-waši, on the cuneiform tablet of B. C. 651 found at Gezer, was an Egyptian (*PEF. Quart. Stat.*, 1904, pp. 239, 243) would (if sound) be evidence of the persistence of conditions which could affect the traditions of the south.

It is safer to recognize the presence of conflicting traditions than to attempt to reconcile them, and if the reality of S can be maintained, it is certainly difficult to find the factor which led to the victory of E. That there was considerable fusion and compromise is to be expected¹, and this can probably be discovered in the traditions of Saul and David. Saul is naturally associated with central Palestine, he enters into a covenant with Gibeon, and both Gibeon and Beeroth have cause to avenge themselves upon his descendants. The hostility of a people to the south is reflected also in the stories of Joshua's wars. But the evidence suggests that this population (roughly comprised in the later terms Judah and Benjamin) was closely related to the south of Palestine², and was intimately connected with those clans whose traditions appear in S. If the conjecture could be made that the extension southwards (of Joseph tribes) was after that which had already begun to extend northwards, it would result that the former was superimposed upon the latter, which is precisely the fate of S when it was taken over into E³. Before the union of central Palestine and the south, traditions from the standpoint of the one would regard the other as hostile. But when a union was effected, compromises were made. These would everywhere take various forms, since in the merging and development of traditions many minor factors must have influenced their course. In the final scheme, as set forth in Judges i, all the tribes—including Judah and Simeon—are sons of Israel and have one common starting-point for their expeditions to occupy the promised land, and it is possible that a recollection of the hostility which subsisted between central Palestine and the south is expressed by the view, also conveyed in the same chapter, that the unfriendly neighbour of each consisted of an intervening strip of land which was held by the earlier non-Israelite inhabitants⁴.

¹ See on Joshua, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 759 above.

² See above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 540.

³ With this compare the view of Guthe that Israel proper reached Palestine from the east *later* than Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah (*Ency. Bib.*, col. 2225), or of H. W. Hogg, that Benjamin occupied districts which had been associated with Simeon, Reuben, Dan (col. 535), Dan being "not impossibly" *older* than Joseph, or an "unsuccessful precursor of Benjamin." (It will be noticed that the birth of Benjamin follows after the dispersion of Simeon and Levi in Gen. xxxiv.) Such views based upon the tribal traditions alone do not appear to take sufficient account of the possibility that historical events of later date (J and E are placed in the 9th-8th century at the earliest) may have helped their growth.

⁴ See more fully above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 356 sq.

These conditions are evidently ignored : (a) when Saul's sovereignty extends over Judah (1 Sam. xv, xxiii. 6 sqq., xxvii. 10, 12¹) ; (b) when David has his home in Bethlehem and has friendly relations with Israel and the court of Saul, and (c) when the latter is in Benjamin. It will be noticed that 1 Sam. xv. 2 points to Exod. xvii. 16 and Deut. xxv. 17-19, and represents a relatively late stage in the traditions of the Exodus², and even 1 Sam. xxx. 26 (Amalek the enemy of Yahweh), although one of the oldest sources of David's life, refers to former Amalekite hostility in a way that seems to ignore the *successful* movement northwards (Num. xxi. 1-3)³. Two distinct standpoints are found, also, when, on the one hand, the annalist records that Saul's kingdom was set up at Mahanaim (2 Sam. ii. 8-10), and, on the other, when Mahanaim becomes the place where David found a refuge ; and equally important differences show themselves in the contiguous, though now contradictory chronological notices in 2 Sam. ii. 10 and 11⁴. Under these circumstances the traditions of the relations of David to Saul's house appeared to require more critical handling⁵.

Among the narratives which go to build up the story of Saul's rise we find a similarity of topics in Judges xiii sqq. when compared with 1 Sam. i sqq. In Judges we meet with the Danite Samson the Nazirite, the Danite migration (cp. names in xviii. 2, 12 with xiii. 25), the Bethlehem Levite the grandson of Moses, the unnamed sanctuary of Ephraim, the Ephraimite Levite allied by marriage with Bethlehem. The relation of these to S has already been noticed. On turning to 1 Sam. we find the Nazirite Samuel son of Elkanah ben Jeroham the Zuphite, the ark at Shiloh the Ephraimite sanctuary, Eli and the priests of Mosaïte (or Aaronite) origin, further, the places Bethshemesh and Kirjath-jearim (cp. Judges xviii. 12), and the significant personal names Phinehas, Abiathar, Joshua, Abinadab (cp. Nadab, Exod. xxiv. 1, and above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 754 and note 1), and Eleazar. The general tone is illustrated also by the references to the deliverance of Israel from Egypt in 1 Sam. iv. 8, vi. 6. It agrees with the development of tradition, noticeable in Exodus and Numbers, that these are partly reminiscent of Kadesh traditions ; they also ignore the non-Israelite district between Judah and Joseph. The prominence of Shiloh associates itself with the history of Israel in the book of Joshua, and it is interesting that the narratives regarding the old family of priests probably preserve in the name Ichabod a tradition of the family of Moses⁶. Two points of view may be

¹ Above, *J. Q. R.*, XVII, 788.

² Above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 756, n. 1.

³ *Ibid.*, 758 sq.

⁴ Cp. above, *J. Q. R.*, XVII, 792.

⁵ Above, *J. Q. R.*, XVII, 796 sq.

⁶ For Ichabod as an intentional alteration of Jochebed, see *Ency. Bib.*, col. 2144 (cp. also Wellhausen, *Comp. Hex.*, 1899, p. 371).

observed. On the one hand, Joshua of Timnath-heres ("T. of the sun"), the hero of E's conquest of Palestine from the east, finds a place at Beth-Shemesh ("house of the sun") in the neighbourhood of Danite and allied clans in much the same way that a place had to be found for him in another part of S¹. On the other hand, E has apparently derived from S the tradition of its Mosaic clans, and Shiloh must needs claim relationship with the family of Moses. Moreover, Samuel, although indisputably Ephraimite, as the narratives stand, is a descendant of Jerahmeel (so LXX for Jeroham in 1 Sam. i. 1), and it can hardly be supposed that this name has here lost its original ethnical force². This, if correct, is of no little interest for the traditions of his relations with David, and suggests a semi-historical foundation for the later theory that he was a Levite³.

In the course of the growth of hierarchical institutions, Moses is replaced by Aaron, and the changes that influenced the narratives of the Exodus find their counterpart in the disgrace and disappearance of both Dan and Shiloh. The Mosaic clans of Dan pass out of

¹ Viz. Exod. xvii. 8 sqq. which ignores the defeat in Num. xiv. 43-45 (leading to the circuitous journey into Palestine), but develops the victory in Num. xxi. 1-3 (see *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 759, n. 2). Contrast with this compromise the retention of the independent standpoint (p. 174, n. 1).

² The alternative view that the genealogy is conflated, and that Eli was of southern origin would strengthen the above views, and Jastrow's suggestion that Shēmū'el is only a modification of Shēbū'el, and therefore of Shobal (cp. p. 170 above) should be noticed; see *Ency. Bib.*, col. 4496.

³ The southern origin of Samuel has been suspected previously on other grounds (*J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 534). In regard to the chronicler's theory in 1 Chron. vi, it is clear that (a) the connexion of the Levites as a whole with the south can be independently maintained; and that (b) there was obviously a period when the Levites were not known under that specific name. Accordingly, there may have been a tendency to "Levitize" prominent men of southern origin, e. g. Obed-edom, Heman, or Ethan. Joshua, it will be noticed, is left untouched—not unnaturally, since he did not belong to the southern cycle of tradition. It may be added that the Jerahmeelite names Nathan and Zabad may be identified with David's prophet and the officer otherwise known as Zabud (so, as regards the latter, Bishop Hervey). It is possible, therefore, that Nathan and Samuel belonged to the same clan in old tradition. The name of Gad, another of David's seers, suggests an association with the "son" of Leah's maid Zilpah (for the conjecture that this name should be connected with Zelophehad, see above, p. 177, n. 2 end), but it seems too much to suppose that the relationship with east Jordan clans (p. 175 sqq. above) should be introduced in this manner, and we may treat it as a coincidence—although a curious one.

existence, and those of Shiloh are threatened with the supremacy of a new line of priests: the Zadokites. In the story of Eli, 1 Sam. ii. 27-36 betrays an acquaintance with subsequent events and directly alludes to the steps which other writers attribute to Josiah. Changes of ritual, already duly reflected in the traditions around Kadesh and Sinai, find their representation in the early history of the monarchy, and when the figure of Zadok is introduced into the history of David by the side of Abiathar whom he ultimately supersedes, we may probably recognize the desire to co-ordinate the building of the temple by Solomon with the institution of the Zadokite priests at Jerusalem¹. Similarly the institution of the calf-worship is associated with Jeroboam.

In conclusion, the studies which have been undertaken in the present series of notes have led to the theory that two main views prevailed in ancient Israel regarding its origin. The belief that it had entered from beyond the Jordan and spread over the land of Palestine, whether in the course of a gradual movement (Judges i), or as the result of great conquests (book of Joshua), has superseded, it is argued, an earlier one wherein it was held that the movement came from the south. Doubtless the (suggested) earlier view of Israel's origin was unjustifiably claimed by clans or tribes to the same extent that the subsequent popular one expresses conditions which, as critics agree, are not altogether reliable. Neither of the two schemes is free from serious historical difficulties; a fact which is generally admitted as regards the latter, and must be confessed in respect to the former. How fundamentally the earlier southern tradition or rather body of traditions affects the narratives relating to the history of the eleventh century B.C. is obvious². But the

¹ When a prophet of Shiloh appears in the time of Jeroboam (1 Kings xi. 29 sqq.) it is not likely that the writer forgot the disasters which are implied after 1 Sam. vii. 2, since the fall of Shiloh was a recent event in Jeremiah's day. The true *sequence* is observed when the priests are subsequently found at Nob (1 Sam. xxi. sq.—if Nob lay north of Jerusalem, cp. Anathoth, 1 Kings ii. 26, also the home of Jeremiah), and the case finds an analogy in the relative position of Exod. xvi sqq. (presupposing a law-giving) after *ibid.* xv. 25; see above *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 747.

² This is not in itself a fatal objection, for it is precisely the details which are at variance with the prevailing traditions (upon which our conceptions of Hebrew history are largely based) that require close attention. Even in so vital a matter as the origin of Yahweh-worship it cannot be overlooked that one representation carried it back to the earliest times (Gen. iv. 26), and the evidence, however isolated, must have had some meaning in the age when it was first written down. If

theory does not spring from *a priori* assumptions based upon the remarkable amount of material at this period as contrasted with later history (above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 133 sq., 542). If some reliance has been placed upon narratives whose lateness (it may be objected) renders their contents suspicious, it is necessary to point to the persistence of tradition and to the agreement in the situations which made it impossible to reject or accept arbitrarily individual details merely on account of the source in which they were contained or the date to which each is ascribed by modern criticism. Literary analysis is the indispensable prelude to historical criticism, but the dates that result must be checked by the criticism of the historical records (see above, *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 528)¹.

STANLEY A. COOK.

this cycle of southern traditions can be substantiated, it is evident from a number of points that it underwent a lengthy historical development. But the chronological limits can scarcely be examined without taking into account the entire history of Judah, and it is very evident that the genealogical relations between the southern clans and Edom (the presumed dates of the Edomite genealogical notices are particularly important) show that the history of Edom is a valuable factor in the inquiry.

¹ À propos of this it may seem remarkable that the Calebite genealogies in 1 Chron. ii cover something like half a millenium. It is agreed that the earlier portions of the Calebite genealogy reflect conditions which are found in the narratives of David's life; it is agreed, also, that the later portions represent the situation in the exile when the clan held seats further to the north. Accordingly, it appears that it did not move up when David captured Jerusalem and cleared the intervening district of its hostile inhabitants; it was not affected by the migrations of allied clans (Danites, Kenites), and notwithstanding the serious disasters which shook the kingdom of Judah, it succeeded in maintaining itself for many centuries merely moving a trifling distance northwards in this lengthy period! It is only when one considers what this means that the current view of 1 Chron. ii is "not an easy one" (*J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 354, n. 1). The precise relation of these clans to Judah is perplexing because they do not appear to have coalesced with Judah until a very late date (cp. Meyer, *Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, pp. 407-9). But what was Judah without their numbers? Here, as also in the Edomite evidence, and in the traditions of the tribes, the chronological relation of the sources and the relation of the conditions they represent to the historical scheme make the problems the more intricate.

(To be concluded.)